

REMARKS

The present application includes claims 1-3, 6-9, and 11-27. Claims 1, 2, and 25-27 were rejected. Claims 3 and 6-9 were objected to. Claims 11-24 were allowed. By this Amendment, claim 1 has been amended, claim 3 has been cancelled, and new claims 28-31 have been added.

Claims 1, 2, and 25-27 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Stephen et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,880,787) in view of Collins et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,613,053).

Claims 3 and 6-9 were objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim.

Claims 11-24 were allowed.

The Applicants now turn to the rejection of claims 1, 2, and 25-27 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Stephen in view of Collins.

Claim 1 has been amended, and includes all of the limitations of claim 3. In the Final Office Action that was mailed on May 29, 2008, the Examiner indicated that claim 3 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Therefore, the Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection of claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Stephen in view of Collins has been overcome, and that claim 1 is in condition for allowance.

Claims 2 and 25-27 depend from independent claim 1. As described above, claim 1 is in condition for allowance. Therefore, the Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection of claims 2 and 25-27 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Stephen in view of Collins has been overcome, and that claims 2 and 25-27 are in condition for allowance.

The Applicants now turn to the objection to claims 3 and 6-9 as being dependent upon a rejected base claim.

Claim 3 has been cancelled. Therefore, the Applicants respectfully submit that the objection to claim 3 as being dependent upon a rejected base claim is moot.

Claims 6-9 depend, either directly or indirectly, from independent claim 1. As described above, claim 1 is in condition for allowance. Therefore, the Applicants respectfully submit that the objection to claims 6-9 as being dependent upon a rejected base claim has been overcome, and that claims 6-9 are in condition for allowance.

The Applicants would like to thank the Examiner for allowing claims 11-24.

The Applicants now turn to new claims 28-31. New claim 28 has been added, and includes the limitations of claim 6. New claims 29-31 have been added, and include all of the limitations of claims 7-9, respectively, and depend, either directly or indirectly, from claim 28. In the Final Office Action that was mailed on May 29, 2009, the Examiner indicated that claims 6-9 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Therefore, the Applicants respectfully submit that new claims 28-31 are in condition for allowance.

Accordingly, for the reasons stated above, the Applicants respectfully submit that claims 1, 2, 6-9, and 11-31 are in condition for allowance.

CONCLUSION

The Applicants respectfully submit that the claims of the present application are in condition for allowance.

If the Examiner has any questions or the Applicants may be of any assistance, the Examiner is invited and encouraged to contact the Attorney for Applicants at the number below.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any necessary fees or credit any overpayment to the Deposit Account No. 16-0228.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: July 28, 2008



James H. Williams

Reg. No. 56,883

Attorney for Applicants

Panduit Corp.
Legal Department – TP12
17301 S. Ridgeland Avenue
Tinley Park, Illinois 60477-3091
(708) 532-1800, Ext. 1302